



contemplating an embodiment of the diaper wherein more than one container assembly of powder, oil and/or towel was adhered thereto. For example, a diaper could be provided having one container assembly with powder therein, one container assembly with oil therein, and two containers assemblies with towels therein.

In the passage relied on by the Board, Ehrlich expressly refers to the powder, oil and towel as being the "major elements" of the container assemblies. In other words, the powder, oil and towel are the most important components of the container assemblies. Thus, why would one of ordinary skill in the art replace one of the "major elements" of the container assemblies with something completely unrelated to changing a diaper? They would not.

Accordingly, the passage relied on by the Board does not "explicitly contemplate[s] inclusion of other baby maintenance items in addition to or in place of the specifically illustrated powder, oil, and towel containers." Ehrlich only contemplates placing baby maintenance items used during and related to changing diapers (i.e., powder, oil, and towels) in the container assemblies disclosed therein and nothing more.

Thus, the Board misapprehended the disclosure of Ehrlich in finding that it discloses more than it actually does and relied on its misapprehension in finding the claims of this application obvious over Ehrlich in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,856 (Gallo).

Moreover, the Board opined that "a person of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated that it would have been advantageous to include sunscreen, a well-known accessory for the care/protection of babies for outdoor activities, on the

diaper of Ehrlich, so that the sunscreen would be available when needed." See page 5 of the Board's Decision. Appellants respectfully submit that the Board's rationale is overly broad and overly inclusive.

Following the Board's rationale, attaching any of the baby care or baby protection products listed by Gallo to the diaper of Ehrlich would have been obvious to one skilled in the art so that they would be available when needed. The baby care/baby protection products provided below are listed in the same paragraph by Gallo's as sunscreen. See col. 5, lines 20-30 of Gallo.

|                          |                        |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Antibiotic ointments     | Rubbing alcohol        |
| Petroleum jelly          | Cotton swabs           |
| Saline drops             | Sunscreen              |
| Powder                   | Insect repellant       |
| Syrup of Ipecac          | Baby oil               |
| Bandages                 | Instant ice packs      |
| Nail clippers            | Hydrogen peroxide      |
| Anti-inflammatory creams | Aloe Vera lotions      |
| Thermometer strips       | Electrolytic solutions |
| Cotton balls             |                        |

It is appellants' position that, at best, it would have been obvious to attach only the products listed by Gallo that are related to changing a diaper (e.g., petroleum jelly, powder, baby oil) to the diaper of Ehrlich. It clearly would not have been obvious at the time of the present invention to attach any of the items disclosed by Gallo that are not related to changing a diaper to the diaper of Ehrlich. For example, clearly one skilled in the art would not have found it obvious to adhere a

container assembly having nail clippers, instant ice packs, or electrolytic solutions therein to the diaper of Ehrlich even though it would make them available when they are needed. As can be seen by these examples, the Boards rationale for attaching an assembly container having sunscreen therein to a diaper is in error. It would have been no more obvious to attach a container assembly having sunscreen therein as it would have been to attach a container having either a nail clippers, an instant ice pack or electrolytic solution. Accordingly, the Board's rationale for finding the claimed invention obvious over Ehrlich in view of Gallo was in error and cannot be maintained.

As a result, Appellants respectfully request that the Board's Decision upholding the Office's finding that claims 18, 23, 28 and 29 as being obvious over Ehrlich in view of Gallo be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard L. Bridge/

Richard L. Bridge, Reg. No. 40,529  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, 26th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 621-5070

RLB/PEB/tmg

Via EFS